# Cahoy Supp. Dec. Ex. 99

```
1
                    UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
               FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
                        SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 4
      IN RE: DA VINCI SURGICAL
     ROBOT ANTITRUST LITIGATION ) Lead Case No.:
 5
                               ____) 3:21-cv-03825-VC
      SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE
6
      COMPANY, INC.,
                                    ) Case No.:
 7
                                    ) 3:21-cv-03496-VC
                 Plaintiff,
8
            vs.
9
      INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
10
                 Defendants.
11
      THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
12
      ALL ACTIONS
13
14
15
                           DEPOSITION OF:
16
                       GRETA VALENTINE BERNIER
17
                       MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2022
                       3:35 p.m. Eastern Time
18
19
20
     REPORTED BY:
21
     Vickie Blair
22
     CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR
      JOB NO. 5568494
2.3
24
25
     PAGES 1 - 56
                                                Page 1
```

```
1
      Deposition of GRETA VALENTINE BERNIER, the witness,
 2
      taken on behalf of the Defendants, on Monday,
      November 7, 2022, 3:35 p.m. Eastern Time, before VICKIE
 3
      BLAIR, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR.
 4
 5
      APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL VIA ZOOM:
 6
 7
 8
      FOR THE WITNESS AND THE PROPOSED CLASS:
 9
                COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL
                BY CHRISTOPHER J. BATEMAN, Associate
10
                88 Pine Street
                Suite 500
                New York, New York 10005
11
                212.838.7797
12
                212.838.7745 Fax
                CBateman@cohenmilstein.com
13
      FOR DEFENDANT INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.:
14
                COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
                BY ISAAC D. CHAPUT, Associate
15
                415 Mission Street
16
                Suite 5400
                San Francisco, California 94105-2533
17
                +1 415 591 7020
                ichaput@cov.com
18
                COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
                BY PAUL STRAUCH, Associate
19
                One CityCenter
20
                850 Tenth Street, NW
                Washington, D.C. 20001-4956
21
                +1 202 662 5033
                pstrauch@cov.com
22
      ALSO PRESENT:
23
                NOAH SUSZCKIEWICZ, Videographer
2.4
25
                                                         Page 2
```

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 177-5 Filed 05/25/23 Page 4 of 10

1	Q	About how long did your meeting with	12:40:48
2	Mr. Bateman	last?	12:40:51
3	А	An hour.	12:40:51
4	Q	Was anyone there apart from you and	12:40:53
5	Mr. Bateman	?	12:41:01
6	А	No.	12:41:01
7	Q	Did you look at any documents in	12:41:02
8	preparation	for today's deposition?	12:41:04
9	А	No.	12:41:05
10	Q	Have you ever spoken with anyone from the	12:41:06
11	Franciscan A	Alliance hospital network in Indiana?	12:41:11
12	А	No.	12:41:17
13	Q	Have you ever spoken with anyone from	12:41:17
14	Larkin Comm	unity Hospital in Miami?	12:41:20
15	А	No.	12:41:22
16	Q	Are you currently employed by Valley	12:41:22
17	Medical?		12:41:28
18	А	Yes.	12:41:28
19	Q	What is your role at Valley?	12:41:28
20	А	I am a colorectal surgeon at Valley, and I	12:41:32
21	am the chie	f of surgery for the medical staff office.	12:41:37
22	Q	How long have you been employed by Valley?	12:41:42
23	А	Three years and three months.	12:41:48
24	Q	How long have you been chief of surgery at	12:41:52
25	Valley?		12:41:54
			Page 9

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 177-5 Filed 05/25/23 Page 5 of 10

1	A Yes.	12:48:48
2	Q Do you consider whether a surgical robot	12:48:49
3	is available at the time you need in deciding what	12:48:56
4	surgical modality to use?	12:49:00
5	A No.	12:49:01
6	Q You mentioned previously that your	12:49:01
7	preference for all patients is to offer a robotic	12:49:13
8	approach.	12:49:17
9	Why is that?	12:49:18
10	A Because, in my experience, they have less	12:49:20
11	pain, quicker return of bowel function, shorter length	12:49:27
12	of stay, and, in general, recover better. I also find	12:49:33
13	that my dissection can be more accurate and my	12:49:41
14	visualization or exposure of the things that I need to	12:49:47
15	see is significantly better with the robotic approach	12:49:49
16	than the laparoscopic approach.	12:49:54
17	Q Is is each of benefits that you just	12:49:57
18	described that you have experienced for robotic	12:50:06
19	assisted procedures, are you comparing them both to	12:50:10
20	open and laparoscopic procedures or are there some	12:50:13
21	aspects of those benefits that are equivalent between	12:50:16
22	laparoscopic and robotic assisted?	12:50:23
23	MR. BATEMAN: Objection to form.	12:50:25
24	THE WITNESS: They are not equivalent.	12:50:26
25	There is, I would say, an interval	12:50:27
	Pa	ge 15

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 177-5 Filed 05/25/23 Page 6 of 10

1	improvement each one, so there's a significant	12:50:30
2	improvement between in doing any kind of what we	12:50:33
3	would call minimally invasive surgery, meaning	12:50:36
4	laparoscopic or robotic over open; but, beyond that,	12:50:40
5	there are advantages of using the robotic system beyond	12:50:43
6	straight stick laparoscopy.	12:50:46
7	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:50:48
8	Q When you say that your dissection can be	12:50:54
9	more accurate, what do you mean by that?	12:50:57
10	A Because of the the visibility and the	12:50:58
11	way that the robotic instruments are wristed and can	12:51:02
12	move, we can I can be more fine tuned with my	12:51:07
13	dissection than using laparoscopic instruments which	12:51:12
14	just open, close, and rotate.	12:51:14
15	Q You also mentioned that visualization is	12:51:18
16	significantly better with the robotic approach than	12:51:22
17	with a laparoscopic approach.	12:51:24
18	What do you mean by what do you mean by	12:51:25
19	that?	12:51:30
20	MR. BATEMAN: Objection to form.	12:51:30
21	THE WITNESS: So it's a 3D camera instead	12:51:34
22	of 2D, it I just think the optics in general are	12:51:37
23	better, and then I also have the benefit of being able	12:51:41
24	to control it myself; whereas in a laparoscopic case,	12:51:43
25	an assistant would be holding the camera and showing me	12:51:48
	Pag	ge 16
		I

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 177-5 Filed 05/25/23 Page 7 of 10

1	what they think I should see, which takes a lot of	12:51:51
2	understanding on the assistant's part and ability to	12:51:55
3	take direction.	12:51:58
4	In a robotic case, I control exactly what	12:51:59
5	I'm looking at, and the camera is better.	12:52:01
6	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:52:03
7	Q Have you found that the proportion of	12:52:15
8	surgeries that you perform using a robotic approach has	12:52:17
9	increased over time or has it largely been consistent	12:52:21
10	since you started your practice?	12:52:27
11	A It increased significantly when I moved	12:52:29
12	from the university to Valley.	12:52:31
13	Q Why is that?	12:52:32
14	A Access well, two things, I'm sorry,	12:52:33
15	access and the Xi over the Si.	12:52:39
16	Q By access, do you do you simply mean	12:52:42
17	the availability to book a robotic a robot equipped	12:52:46
18	operating room?	12:52:52
19	A Correct.	12:52:52
20	Q Why has your utilization of the da Vinci	12:52:53
21	system increased with the Xi compared to the Si?	12:53:00
22	A Because most of the operations that we do	12:53:02
23	require operating in what we call multiple quadrants,	12:53:07
24	so not just pointed into one location in the abdomen,	12:53:12
25	the Xi is able to move through multiple quadrants in a	12:53:17
	Pag	ge 17

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 177-5 Filed 05/25/23 Page 8 of 10

1	way that the Si couldn't, or couldn't without	12:53:20
2	significant cumbersome adjustments.	12:53:22
3	When I was operating with the Si, I would	12:53:27
4	have to do half of the operation laparoscopically in	12:53:28
5	the other quadrants and then switch to using the robot	12:53:33
6	in the portion with the most complex dissection or deep	12:53:36
7	in the pelvis is the most common reason for a	12:53:40
8	colorectal surgeon; and, with the Xi, I can do it all	12:53:44
9	with one platform instead of using two different	12:53:47
10	systems for one case.	12:53:50
11	Q I see.	12:53:52
12	Have you found that you're able to	12:53:54
13	complete your procedures more efficiently using the Xi	12:53:56
14	than with the Si?	12:54:00
15	A Yes.	12:54:01
16	MR. BATEMAN: Objection to form.	12:54:01
17	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:54:01
18	Q Does it has has using the Xi reduced	12:54:02
19	the amount of operating time necessary?	12:54:05
20	MR. BATEMAN: Objection to form.	12:54:10
21	THE WITNESS: Over the Si?	12:54:13
22	BY MR. CHAPUT:	12:54:14
23	Q Yes.	12:54:16
24	A The Xi has reduced the time as compared to	12:54:17
25	the or increased the efficiency as compared to the	12:54:20
	Pag	ge 18

## Case 3:21-cv-03496-AMO Document 177-5 Filed 05/25/23 Page 9 of 10

1	Si.	12:54:24
2	Q Are there any surgeries that you perform	12:54:24
3	exclusively using one modality and not the others?	12:54:37
4	A No.	12:54:47
5	Q Does Valley Medical have any policies or	12:54:51
6	procedures that inform your decision of which modality	12:55:05
7	to recommend to your patients?	12:55:10
8	A Does Valley have any policies or	12:55:12
9	procedures that affect the modality I recommend? No.	12:55:17
10	Q Does Valley Medical have any policies or	12:55:21
11	procedures with respect to how you obtain informed	12:55:27
12	consent from your patients?	12:55:32
13	A Yes.	12:55:34
14	Q What are those policies or procedures?	12:55:39
15	A We have a standardized consent form,	12:55:42
16	originally on paper, recently switched to an electronic	12:55:47
17	version that I'll use for all procedures, and then we	12:55:51
18	add our surgical details, and that consent must be	12:55:55
19	signed within 30 days of the operation.	12:56:00
20	Q When you are obtaining informed consent	12:56:06
21	from your patients, do you explain to them the	12:56:10
22	comparative risks and benefit of different surgical	12:56:16
23	modalities?	12:56:20
24	A Yes.	12:56:20
25	Q Does Valley Medical calculate the cost of	12:56:21
	Pag	ge 19

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
2	) ss.
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )
4	I, Vickie Blair, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR, in
5	and for the State of California, do hereby certify:
6	That, prior to being examined, the witness
7	named in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn
8	to testify as to the truth, the whole truth, and
9	nothing but the truth;
10	That said deposition was taken before me
11	at the time and place therein set forth, and was taken
12	down by me stenographically and thereafter transcribed
13	via computer-aided transcription under my direction and
14	is a true record of the testimony given;
15	I further certify I am neither counsel
16	for, nor related to, any party to said action, nor
17	interested in the outcome thereof;
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto
19	subscribed my name this 20th day of November, 2022.
20	
21	
22	
23	U) 1. 61.
24	Cickie Valan
25	Vickie Blair, CSR No. 8940, RPR-CRR
	Page 53